

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claims 1-10 are rejected.

Claims 1, 6, 8, and 10 are amended to eliminate the previous “adapted to” language as to affirmative recite various means for clauses instead. The adapted to clauses were primarily used because the application was drafted in a European format. These claims were also amended for language and clarity in other places.

Claim 3 is amended to eliminate the “initial” from the claim.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

### **I. Claim Objections**

The Applicants have attempted to fix the claims to address the various objections made to such claims by the Examiner. If such claims still have such deficiencies, the Applicants would be willing to fix such problems via a telephonic interview, or in a manner suggested to by the Examiner.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 6, 8, and 10 for various antecedent basis problems. In view of the amendments made to such claims, Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to such claims.

For instance, Claim 1 now recites a routing device. Claim 6 had “the original frame” changed to “the received frame” and “the second frame” was changed to “the new frame”. Claim 8 is changed from “the initial frame” to “the received frame”. Claim 10 is changed in a manner similar to Claim 6.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahajan et al (U.S. Patent 6,735,201B1, hereafter referred to as 'Mahajan'). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

Using Claim 1 as an exemplary claim for the Application, the claimed element of checking whether the frame contains a multicast group management message has a different outcome than as disclosed or suggested in Mahajan. In the present invention, if such a step has an affirmative outcome, a function of "creating a new frame comprising as a destination address the destination address of an internal multicast group management module and as a payload at least the multicast management data of the received frame" is performed. Additionally, the new frame is forwarded to the internal bridge function.

In contrast, looking specifically at the test performed in Mahajan at col. 10, lines 21-61, a determination is made whether a packet is an IGMP packet. If the packet is an IGMP packet, a further determination is made whether the packet contains a MAC group address that matches a predetermined MAC address. If the MAC group address does not match, the RE 412 ignores a forwarding address and the packet will be processed by the NMP 316 to decide how such a packet is to be forwarded by switch 300 (col. 10, lines 32-44). If the MAC address does match, the packet is forwarded to the appropriate PLCs 310, 312, and 320 (col. 10, lines 45-57). Note, neither of these conditions is the same as "creating a frame" or the additional steps of Claim 1. Applicants assert that Claims 6 and 10 are patentable for the same reasons given for Claim 1. Additionally, Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are believed to be patentable, for the same reasons given above.

In regards to the cited prior art, but not used in the rejection:

US20030123453 deals with a system that prevents duplication of multicast traffic in an Ethernet MAN. It uses a multicast VLAN tag for multicast traffic specifically. It doesn't disclose the creation of a new frame on detection of an IGMP message.

US06457059B1 deals with a communication control unit that is adapted to transfer multicast data only to required ports instead of all the ports

Serial Number  
10/528,598

PF020122  
Customer No. 24498

as in the prior art. It doesn't disclose the creation of a new frame as indicated in the claim 1.

US06778547B1 deals with a switching device that is designed to increase system reliability. It includes a decision making engine for making frame forwarding decisions. It doesn't disclose the creation of a new frame as indicated in the claim 1.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's objections and rejections, it is believed that this patent application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,  
S. Dumet et al.

/Joel M. Fogelson/  
Joel M. Fogelson  
Reg. No. 24498  
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
Two Independence Way  
Suite 2  
Princeton, New Jersey 08540  
January 25, 2009